

Remarks and Arguments

Applicants have carefully considered the Office Action dated March 7, 2007 and the references cited therein. Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the application.

Claims 3-17, 19 and 20 remain pending.

Claims 3-5, 8-12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,792,145, Gay, already of record, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,903,646, Rackman, also already of record. Notwithstanding a contrary position in the office action of September 12, 2006, the Examiner now alleges that Gay does disclose parsing an original document for selected logistical data comprising any of sender, receiver, original size, subject, date, carbon copies of the original document. The section of Gay cited by the Examiner in support of his contention, however, discloses only the ability to read dates. Accordingly, Claim 3 has been amended to delete the term "dates" therefrom and now recites "parsing the original document for selected logistical data comprising any of sender, receiver, original size, subject, or carbon copies of the original document" (claim 3, lines 4-6). In light of the Examiner's prior acknowledged deficiencies in the Gay and the amendment to claim 3, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 3, as well as its respective dependent claims are patentable over the combined teachings of Gay and Rackman.

Regarding claims 8-12 and 19, the Examiner has alleged that such claims are "in parallel" with claim 3 and are rejected for at least the same reasons. These claims, however, do not recite "parsing the original document for selected logistical data comprising any of sender, receiver, original size, subject, or carbon copies of the original document" as in claim 3. Accordingly, Applicants have been unable to determine the specific basis for which claims 8-12 and 19 are rejected, and, consequently, are unable to provide any substantive response to such rejections at this time. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide the specific claim and reference sections on which claim 8-12 and 19 are rejected so that Applicants and their counsel can consider the same.

Claims 6, 7, 13-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay in view of Rackman and further in view of U.S. Publication No.

2004/0205535, Newman et al., hereafter Newman. Applicants traverse such rejection on the grounds that the Examiner has failed to create a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In accordance with MPEP §2143.03, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness 1) the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest *all* of the claim limitations; 2) there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or combine references; and 3) there must be a reasonable expectation of success.

The Examiner has not shown where the combined teachings of Gay, Rackman and Newman teach or suggest *all* of the limitations of claim 6. Claim 6 currently recites “presenting an organized plurality of shadow documents with graphical representations in a parallel tree arrangement” (Claim 6, lines 9-10). The section of Newman cited by the Examiner (Newman, Paragraph 34) does not teach disclose or suggest a parallel tree format. Nor is there any teaching or disclosure of a presentation of anything other than the format illustrated in Figures 1-15 of Newman. Examiner will note that the tree 350 of figure 19 is a conceptual outline layout which is then transformed into a displayable layout suitable for a browser (Newman, Paragraph 104-105). As such Newman does not disclose presenting an organized plurality of shadow documents with graphical representations in a parallel tree arrangement, that is the teaching which the Examiner has admitted is missing from Gay. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 6, as well as its respective dependant claims are patentable over the combined teachings of Gay, Rackman and Newman.

Claims 7 and 17, recite limitations similar to that described above with reference to claim 6, and, along with their respective dependant claims, are patentable over the combined teachings of Gay, Rackman and Newman, for atleast the same reasons as claim 6, as well as for the merits of their own respective limitations.

Regarding claim 20, the Examiner has alleged that such claim is “in parallel” with claim 6 and is rejected for at least the same reasons. Claim 20, however, does not recite “presenting an organized plurality of shadow documents with graphical representations in a parallel tree arrangement” as in claims 6, 7 and 17. Accordingly, Applicants have been unable to determine the specific basis for which claim 20 is rejected, and, consequently, are unable to provide any substantive response to such

rejection at this time. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide the specific claim and reference sections on which claim 20 is rejected so that Applicants and their counsel can consider the same.

In addition, Applicants reserve the right to submit as a supplement to this response, or in response to subsequent office actions, evidence in the form of a declaration or affidavit under 37 CFR 1.131 to establish that the inventive activities of the Applicants preceded the effective date of the Newman reference.

Applicants respectfully reassert all of the remarks and traversals set forth in prior responses to the extent still relevant to the outstanding rejections.

Applicants believe the claims are in allowable condition. A notice of allowance for this application is solicited earnestly. If the Examiner has any further questions regarding this amendment, he is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the number listed below. The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any balances under 37 CFR §1.17, and 1.16 to Deposit Account No. DA-12-2158.

Respectfully submitted,

/Bruce D. Jobse/

Date: 2007-06-07

Bruce D. Jobse, Esq. Reg. No. 33,518
Rissman Jobse Hendricks & Oliverio, LLP
Customer Number 021127
Tel: (617) 367-4600 Fax: (617) 367-4656